

June 21, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E-3493

ceived in April, argued that existence of a standby draft only gives us a false sense of security and provides "an excuse for not taking the hard steps that will strengthen our Reserve forces to the point where they can effectively back up our active forces." I hope all who vote tomorrow will weigh carefully his well-stated views.

The statement follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY VIEWS

(By Martin Anderson)

I find that I cannot support the Commission's recommendation that we reconstitute a standby draft system.

In the case of a sudden threat to our national security, any form of a draft is virtually worthless; it simply takes too much time to train a person to be a competent soldier. The best we could hope for—standby draft or not—would be an influx of reluctant untrained troops many months after we needed them. As the Commission report itself states in Chapter IX, "The changing nature of war and its technology will not allow for any lengthy period of time for national mobilization for a major conflict. Thus, the national security relies on the ability to mobilize our Reserve Forces from a peacetime 'citizen soldier' status to a combat-ready soldier status in a relatively short time."

What is vital to our national security is a large Reserve Force, one that is really ready, one that can be called into service in a matter of days in case of emergency. The existence of a standby draft will only give a false sense of security to our people and our political leaders. It will be used as an excuse for not taking the hard steps that will strengthen our Reserve Forces to the point where they can effectively back up our active forces.

Clinging to a standby draft will also give false hopes to those who wish to dodge the managerial difficulties and cost of sustaining an All Volunteer Force, to those who would inflict the unconscionable agonies of the draft once again on the youth of the Nation and rest a good part of our national security on the skill and judgment of teenage conscripts rather than trained mature reservists.

The existence of a standby draft diminishes our national security and calls into question the commitment this Nation made a few years ago to raise its military manpower in a manner consistent with the principles on which it was founded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1976

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to long-standing commitments in my district, I was forced to leave Washington on Friday, June 18, before the House had completed consideration of H.R. 14239, the appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for the Judiciary and related agencies.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll No. 410, the Holtzman amendment to increase funds for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; "nay" on roll No. 411, the Miller motion to recommit the bill; and "yea" on roll No. 412, final passage.

INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT: WHAT IS THE HOUSE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1976

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some time ago both Houses of this Congress completed their investigations of this Nation's intelligence community. The ultimate objective of this effort was reform and the recommendations that emerged from these extensive probes provided a wealth of material upon which to build a reformation.

Commendably, the Senate, by establishing a strong Oversight Committee, is well on its way toward implementing the most important of those proposals that pertain to Congress.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to keep pace with our senatorial colleagues. If anything, we seem to be back where we were prior to the commencement of our inquiries.

Such a turn of events is a stinging indictment of our ability to handle a matter of grave and pervasive importance. Despite the fact that over the past year the Murphy and Rockefeller Commissions, as well as both congressional Select Intelligence Committees, have strongly urged this Congress to concentrate rather than diffuse its intelligence oversight responsibility, this House continues an arrangement that has been proven conclusively to be wholly inadequate.

Since the inception of this session of Congress more than a score of intelligence oversight bills have been introduced in the House, and as far as I can determine, none of these have been even considered by the Rules Committee, much less reached the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely imperative that we tarry no longer on this matter. Admittedly, this is a tough issue, but this Congress over the past 18 months has addressed a number of issues of commensurate difficulty and acquitted itself handsomely.

To walk away and shun an issue that has been a focal point of national attention for months would seriously mar an otherwise legislatively productive session. Moreover, if we leave this business unfinished, we can all count on our constituencies calling us to task during this election year for failing to bite such an important bullet.

Mr. Speaker, all this leads me respectfully to ask you to request the chairman of the Rules Committee to begin immediately a series of hearings on the various intelligence oversight proposals that are presently before this House. As I said earlier, thanks to exhaustive studies by both the executive and legislative branches of this Government, we now are all well aware of what this body needs to practice meaningful oversight. I am confident that, although as in the Senate it may be tough going along the way, we will be satisfied

with what ultimately evolves from these hearings. Most assuredly the final product will be an amalgamation of sundry ideas hammered out on the anvil of compromise. But that notwithstanding, I am sure it will represent a quantum jump forward over what currently masquerades as intelligence oversight. To those who may doubt this forecast, I suggest that they take a look at what has and is happening in the Chamber next door.

PREVENTING IMPROPER INFLUENCE OF FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1976

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, more than 4 years have passed since the Watergate break-in, and in that time Federal law enforcement has been scrutinized and studied by many diverse persons and groups. In June of 1973, shortly after the break-in, the president of the American Bar Association set up a special committee "to study the basic organizational framework for all the investigative and prosecutorial functions of the Federal justice system."

That committee, whose chairman was William B. Spann, Jr., of Atlanta, submitted its report entitled "Preventing Improper Influence on Federal Law Enforcement Agencies," which was approved by the ABA House of Delegates in February of this year. It recommended, among other things, that a Division of Government Crimes be established within the Justice Department to handle violations of Federal law by Government officials, violations of Federal campaign laws, and cases referred by the Federal Election Commission. It also recommended a procedure for appointing a temporary special prosecutor in appropriate cases.

These recommendations have been incorporated into title I of S. 495, the Watergate Reorganization and Reform Act of 1976. That bill, as its short title implies, is a comprehensive measure and includes provisions creating an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel and requiring certain financial disclosures by Government personnel. The Senate Committee on Government Operations reported favorably on the bill early last month, and the Senate is expected to take it up within the next 2 weeks.

In the House, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice has had legislative jurisdiction over special prosecutor legislation. Some of you may recall that in October and November of 1973, the subcommittee held several hearings concerning the appointment of a special prosecutor to handle the Watergate investigations. In fact, the subcommittee and the Committee on the Judiciary both recommended legislation on this subject.

It therefore seems appropriate, in view of the developments in the Senate, for

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Executive Registry

76-2636

FROM:

EXTENSION

NO.

Legislative Counsel

DATE

23 June 1976

STATIN

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

Director

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

I know you will be interested in the attached remarks by Rep. Broomfield. It has also come to our attention that Rep. Broomfield's remarks were cited by Rep. Sisk and seconded by Rep. Madden, Chairman of the House Rules Committee, at a meeting of the Rules Committee on 22 June. You can be sure we will stay on top of this and keep you advised. It is our understanding that hearings could possibly begin on this subject as early as next week.

STATIN

George L. Cary
Legislative Counsel

OLC

☐ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ UNCLASSIFIED